	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	09/945,469	LASALLE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Igor Borissov	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *Amendment - After Non-Final Rejection - filed on 6/13/2006.*

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *2-16,40,41 and 44-46.*

3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None   of the:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☒ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☒ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

      1) ☒ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of

      Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

IGOR N. BORISSOV
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment received on 10/29/2004 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 1, 17-39, 42 and 43 have been canceled. New claims 45 and 46 have been added. Claims 2-16, 40, 41, and 44-46 are currently pending in the application.

Remarks

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102 and Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103 have been withdrawn due to the applicant's amendment.

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 45 and 45 have been renumbered as 45 and 46.

Allowable Subject Matter

Independent Claims 2, 13 and 44 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding claim 2, the best prior art of record (Tarrant in view of Krysiak et al.) discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

generating at least one entity trust list containing at least one characteristic of at least two of the entities, a level of trust being gauged by the at least one characteristic; generating at least one transactional trust list containing at least one parameter relative to an exchange between at least two of the entities through at least one degree of

separation between the entities; and creating at least one receiving component that obtains information from the at least one entity trust list and the at least one transactional trust list in order to provide a framework for at least two of the entities to establish relationships between one another.

However, the prior art of record does not disclose that said at least one proxy parameter being indicative of an action that a trusted party can perform on behalf of a trusting party.

Regarding claim 13, the best prior art of record (Tarrant in view of Krysiak et al.) discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

generating an entity trust list containing at least one characteristic of at least two of the entities, a level of trust being gauged by the at least one characteristic; generating transactional trust list containing at least one parameter relative to an exchange between at least two of the entities through at least one degree of separation between the entities; generating a capability domain and activity trust level data base for each of the at least two entities, the data base having a plurality of levels of trust and a plurality of entity roles, the capability domain and activity trust data base comprising a plurality of entries, each entry being indexed by an entity role and a level of trust, each said entry being indicative of a corresponding business process; and creating at least one receiving component that obtains information from the entity trust list and the transactional trust list in order to provide a framework for at least two of the entities to establish relationships between one another.

However, the prior art of record does not disclose that said at least one proxy parameter being indicative of an action that a trusted party can perform on behalf of a trusting party.

Regarding claim 44, the best prior art of record (Tarrant in view of Krysiak et al.) discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

creating a trust component that stores a trust level for each directly interconnected entity and at least one corresponding valuation criterion for determining the trust level and that obtains an associated trust level of a sought entity through an interconnected intermediate entity if the sought entity is not directly interconnected to the selected entity, the trust component comprising: an entity trust portion that includes a first data structure, the first data structure storing a distinguishing characteristic of each said directly interconnected entity, degree of trust being indicative of the distinguishing characteristic; and a transactional trust portion that includes a second data structure, the second data structure including a plurality of transactional parameters being indicative of criteria for conducting the new business relationship, and creating a transactional component for sharing information with the other interconnected entity.

However, the prior art of record does not disclose that said the plurality of transactional parameters included in the second data structure comprise: a proxy parameter that is indicative of an activity, the activity being performed by a trusted party on behalf of a trusting party; and a plurality of activity-trust parameters being indexed by an activity trust domain and a capability domain, the activity trust domain being indicative of an activity trust level, the capability domain being indicative of an activity process level, each activity trust parameter being indicative of an associated business process.

The best foreign art, Huberman et al. (EP 1 052 582 A2) discloses a method for enabling privacy and trust in electronic community, including: finding shared preferences; discovering communities with shared values; removing disincentives posed by liabilities; and negotiating on behalf of a group.

However, Huberman et al. does not disclose establishing at least one proxy parameter being indicative of an action that a trusted party can perform on behalf of a trusting party; or establishing the plurality of transactional parameters included in the second data structure comprising: a proxy parameter that is indicative of an activity, the activity being performed by a trusted party on behalf of a trusting party; and a plurality of

activity-trust parameters being indexed by an activity trust domain and a capability domain, the activity trust domain being indicative of an activity trust level, the capability domain being indicative of an activity process level, each activity trust parameter being indicative of an associated business process.

The best non-patent literature, Abrams et al. (Is Youe E-Business Trustworty?) discloses an analysis of current e-shopping activity and corresponding Internet fraud.

While outlining certain recommendations how to enhance security of on-line commerce, Abrams et al. fails to disclose establishing at least one proxy parameter being indicative of an action that a trusted party can perform on behalf of a trusting party; or establishing the plurality of transactional parameters included in the second data structure comprising: a proxy parameter that is indicative of an activity, the activity being performed by a trusted party on behalf of a trusting party; and a plurality of activity-trust parameters being indexed by an activity trust domain and a capability domain, the activity trust domain being indicative of an activity trust level, the capability domain being indicative of an activity process level, each activity trust parameter being indicative of an associated business process.

The dependent claims 3-12, 14-16, 40, 41, 45 and 46 are considered allowable as they are dependent and based of an allowable independent claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IB
8/12/2006

IGOR N. BORISSOV
PRIMARY EXAMINER